

July 26, 1967

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 9463

people who presently hold them. The Government already made a profit on these coins when it first issued them, in terms of the difference between their cost of manufacture and their face value. It had not been against the law to melt these coins down until the emergency ban on May 17 and in fact, people had been legally melting nickels down for some time prior to the ban because they were worth more for their silver than their face value.

Coins belong to their holders just as do the stamps which the government issues for postage, and it should be the holder's to do with as he wishes.

Furthermore, if the Government were to melt down the silver coins, it would immediately have the largest supply of silver in the world presently available for the open market. There would be no way in which the Government could sell this silver without playing a significant and meaningful role in the market.

The latter would be a highly undesirable result. Our economic system does not and should not envision the Government playing a role in price determination and price control with respect to such items as silver, unless an emergency situation demanded it or unless it was being treated as a monetary metal.

We could very well be faced here with Treasury continuing to dole out smaller amounts than those necessary to meet demand in order to "maximize its profits."

The Government should not play any role in determining, influencing, or fixing the price of silver. And this can never be accomplished as long as the Treasury or the Government is in the position of selling the silver from our silver coins.

Therefore, in order to provide for a truly free market, without Government influence or control, the ban on melting down coins should be lifted immediately. As long as such action is not taken and as long as the Treasury continues to follow its plan of selling 2 million ounces a week at "market prices," the American public and the American consumer is going to be forced to bear the burden and to pay the unjust and unfair price which will permit the Treasury, the speculators and the producers to "maximize" their profits.

*file*  
**EGYPT'S ALLEGED CONTINUING USE OF POISON GAS**

(Mr. WYMAN (at the request of Mr. McCCLURE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, recent reports in the press leave little room for doubt that Egypt has, for several years, been using poison gas against certain villages in its continuing war against royalist forces in Yemen.

Mr. Speaker, this is not rumor. These allegations appear to have been substantiated by an investigation of the International Red Cross, which, together with the Saudi Arabian Government, has produced conclusive evidence that the Egyptians have, in fact, used and continue to use lethal gas.

I am shocked by these reports. This is an intolerable situation, and yet this Congress and the rest of the civilized world are apparently disregarding this barbaric action.

For months now, the Saudi Arabian delegation to the United Nations has been involved in a futile effort to arouse a sense of indignation within that body. For reasons that I cannot understand, no one is saying anything, and nothing, to my knowledge, is being done to halt this deplorable alleged use of poison gas by Egypt.

Mr. Speaker, how long can the civilized world continue to stand idly by while this practice continues? How long will we continue to permit Hitler-like atrocities, and do nothing about it?

This Congress, this Nation, and the rest of the civilized world, including all shades of political opinion from the "left" to the "right" should demand that this practice be fully and formally investigated. If the charges are indeed true, Egypt should be severely censured, its supply of such gas should be forcibly taken away, and its capability to produce such gas destroyed—sovereignty notwithstanding. World danger exists if this is not dealt with firmly and rapidly. The danger to Israel is more pointed.

Mr. Speaker, the appropriate committees and this Congress should take an initial step by investigating this serious charge to determine its truth. This world cannot, must not, and will not tolerate another Hitler.

To show how series the situation is I enclose articles from the U.S. News & World Report of July 10, 1967, and the Washington Star of July 6, 1967:

[From the U.S. News & World Report, July 10, 1967]

**IN NEW DETAIL—NASSER'S GAS WAR**

LONDON.—Now coming to light are details showing how widespread has been the use of poison gas by Egypt in its war in Yemen.

An investigation by the International Red Cross brought proof of one Egyptian gas attack, against the village of Gahar, in which 75 persons died. The Red Cross reports were published in the July 3 issue of "U.S. News & World Report."

Western intelligence officials say the Red Cross investigation confirmed what has been going on for two years or more. From these sources comes this account of Egyptian gas warfare, largely against civilians:

Since last January, President Gamal Abdel Nasser's forces in Yemen have embarked on an intensified poison-gas campaign. Earlier gas attacks are said to have satisfied Egyptian leaders that world opinion would not be mobilized against them for this violation of the international agreement prohibiting use of gas. In January, these sources say, Egyptians for the first time in history used lethal nerve gases in an air attack on two Yemeni villages—at Hadda on January 4 and at Kitaf on January 5.

More than 200 civilians were said to have been killed in Kitaf.

In April, Egypt were reported to have used mustard gas against three villages held by Yemeni Royalists.

Then, on May 10, Egyptian pilots flying Soviet-built aircraft carried out a gas attack on the village of Gadafa. Fifteen persons were killed.

It was on the same day that 75 were killed in Gahar, in the attack which the Red Cross investigated and confirmed. On May 17, Egyptian raiders returned to Gadafa for another

poison-gas attack which reportedly killed 96 persons sheltered in a cave.

When Yemeni Royalists asked for Red Cross assistance, Egyptian bombers returned to the gassed villages and dropped high-explosive bombs in an effort to obliterate traces of the gas raids.

On May 15, Egyptian bombers attacked two Red Cross vehicles en route to the gassed villages. All the Red Cross equipment was destroyed and a Yemeni Red Cross worker was wounded.

Yemeni Royalists report two attacks during June in the Jauj region. There were said to have been no human casualties, but all livestock in the area reportedly was killed.

What's behind this use of gas?

Intelligence experts say that the Egyptians, probably with the aid of German scientists, have developed a range of poison-gas weapons.

Nasser's Army, sent to Yemen to help put down the Royalist uprising, has been stalled for several years.

Now, it is believed, the poison-gas attacks were ordered by frustrated Egyptians in an effort to terrorize the Royalists into submission.

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., July 26, 1967]

**Egypt's Use of Poison Gas Heightens Tensions**

(By Carl T. Rowan)

Part of the untold drama of the recent Middle East war centered around fears, in Washington and Tel Aviv, that the Egyptians would use a terrifyingly lethal "nerve gas" on the Israelis.

And part of the irony is that the war obscured the fact that the United Arab Republic is using poisonous gases on royalist forces in Yemen.

Reports by the International Red Cross establish beyond doubt that the Egyptians used gas warfare on the villages of Kitaf last January and Gahar in May. An investigating team of Red Cross doctors cabled headquarters that they would not return to Yemen unless supplied gas masks.

Incredibly, despite the surface show of Arab unity in the war against Israel, the Egyptians have within the last three weeks again used poison gas against Yemeni royalists.

Tensions and fears remain high in the Middle East because, although Egypt was so badly beaten in recent fighting that a resumption of conventional warfare seems out of the question, there is always a possibility of the sneak use of gas warfare against Israel.

So great was the fear that gas would be used against Israel when war first broke out that Washington officials moved swiftly and secretly to see that the Israelis got immediate access to 20,000 U.S. gas masks that were in possession of the West Germans.

An urgent shipment of more U.S. gas masks to Israel also was approved. It turned out they were not needed, however, because Israel demolished the Egyptian air force so quickly that the U.A.R. had no chance to resort to gas warfare—if it ever contemplated such.

The Egyptians apparently have no basic compunctions against gas warfare. The Red Cross and the Saudi Arabian government have produced conclusive evidence of such warfare by the U.A.R. in the Yemen conflict.

Last June 2, without naming the U.A.R., the Red Cross confirmed the use of gas in the Yemen and said it was "extremely disturbed and concerned by these methods of warfare." It said it had asked the parties to the war to give a "solemn undertaking" not to use gas or similar poisonous substances.

A report from the Bern (Switzerland) Institute of Forensic Medicine suggests that mustard gas was used in a raid on Gahar the morning of May 10. However, European and

H 9464

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

July 26, 1967

other intelligence reports say that Egypt possesses large quantities of a "nerve gas" so lethal that a drop on the skin of the hand could be fatal.

The victim of this gas, which attacks the sympathetic nervous system, reportedly goes into a cold sweat followed by nausea, cramps, loss of equilibrium and convulsions which lead to a coma, and then death.

A variety of reports tell of seeing containers for this gas with markings in the Cyrillic alphabet of the Soviet Union. There has been speculation that the gas was given to Egypt as a normal part of the military aid from the Soviet Union. Some experts on the U.A.R. maintain, however, that Egypt is capable of producing such gases itself.

An almost bizarre aspect of this gas warfare episode is the seeming indifference of the international community. The Saudi Arabian delegation to the United Nations has tried futilely for months to arouse worldwide cries of indignation. But no one, from Secretary General U Thant on down, is saying anything—apparently because of reluctance to get involved in conflict among the Arabs.

But U.N. diplomats surely are aware that Egyptian possession and usage of poison gases keeps Middle East tensions unusually high. The Israelis are bound to remain at a high state of uneasiness—and military edge-

ment of the Office of Adviser to the President on National Capital Affairs, an office which Mr. Spencer and other former Commissioners consider as being disruptive of the lines of communication between the President and the Board of Commissioners and erosive of the decisionmaking power of the Board.

Mr. Speaker, I strenuously urge our colleagues to make every effort to read and digest Mr. Spencer's letter in order to obtain a more balanced focus on the vital issue involved here. This is important in view of much misinformation that is making the rounds. The letter follows:

NARRAGANSETT, R.I.,  
July 19, 1967.

Hon. ANCHER NELSEN,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN NELSEN: Your letter of July 11, 1967, requesting my comments on the President's plan #3 for the Reorganization of the District of Columbia Government and enclosing a copy of the testimony of management consultant Merrill J. Collett before the House District Committee has been forwarded to me here on vacation. Since I do not have the library facilities available which I would have in Washington, I will not be able to answer your letter as fully and precisely as if I were there, but I am glad to make a few general comments regarding the Reorganization Plan.

I have studied Mr. Collett's testimony. What he says about the combination of policy-making functions and administrative functions in the Commissioners and the division of administrative responsibilities among the three Commissioners is of course true, I think, however, that he has painted the picture in the darkest possible terms and that in practice the District Government has functioned a lot better than reading his statement might lead one to believe. Although over the years there have no doubt been occasions when disagreements between the Commissioners have tended to slow up decision making, I believe that generally the Commissioners have made decisions with reasonable promptness and that delay from this source has not been a major problem in the District Government. The serious delays and stalemates have occurred when conflicts have arisen between District departments and such agencies as the National Capital Planning Commission and the National Park Service which are not controlled by the Commissioners. The Reorganization Plan would not resolve situations of this type.

A three man Board is small enough so that the members can readily keep in close touch with one another, both formally and informally, know one another's thinking, and ordinarily reach decisions very quickly. The usual situation has been a good working relationship among the three Commissioners and a readiness to cooperate in the interest of efficiency and getting things done.

Of the thousands of decisions made by the Commissioners the overwhelming majority have been unanimous and have been reached without extended controversy or disagreement. A split Board has been the exception rather than the rule. Although the President of the Board does not have any more authority legally than the other Commissioners, I think that there has been a tendency, both on the part of the public and among the Commissioners themselves, to look to him as the head of the Government and to be receptive to his leadership. Of course, such things depend to a certain extent on the personalities and abilities of the people involved, and the effectiveness of the system obviously suffers if a serious antagonism develops between the Commission-

ers. However, over the years such antagonisms have, I believe, been infrequent.

Mr. Collett says very little about the Department of General Administration, which has now been functioning for about fifteen years and which has been most useful in pulling together the administration of the District Government and in coordinating the operation of the various departments. The Director of the Department of General Administration has been the central administrative figure in the D.C. Government and a most useful person in initiating and executing all sorts of administrative improvements throughout the Government. The Commissioners have relied heavily upon his judgment and recommendations. He has been a powerful coordinating force among the various departments and has shouldered a tremendous amount of the administrative load.

However, I certainly do not say that the administrative structure of the D.C. Government is perfect or could not be improved. I think that there probably should be a further concentration of administrative authority and that study should be given as to how this can best be accomplished. I believe that ways of increasing the administrative authority of the President of the Board should be explored, also the possibility of employing a city manager, under the Commissioners, who would have full administrative authority over all the departments. In addition, I think that the President should appoint the President of the Board rather than having him elected by the Board as is done at present.

It seems to me that the chief difficulty with the proposed Reorganization Plan and the part of it that would work considerably less well than the present system is the nine member Council. Under the Plan all of the so-called policy-making functions of the Commissioners are turned over to the Council, which would be composed of part-time people paid a relatively small salary. The Council would have many duties and responsibilities of a very varied nature. Approximately twenty-seven pages of the President's Reorganization Plan is devoted to a mere enumeration of these duties and responsibilities. Many of them are of the utmost importance. Although the administrative functions may be somewhat more cumbersome under the Board of Commissioners than under a single executive, the policy making functions are certainly far more streamlined under the present three-man Board of Commissioners than they would be under a nine man Council which must work with the single executive and be subject to his veto power. The nine member Council would be much more cumbersome than the Board of Commissioners, and I believe that its decisions would be less expert than those of the Commissioners, who devote their full time and energy to the District Government.

The range of functions of the District Government is broader than that of any state or local government in the country. It includes what are normally municipal, county, and state functions. Thus, the knowledge and information needed to render sound decisions respecting these manifold operations is very great and taxes even full time people of considerable ability. I believe that it is easier for the President to find two persons who have the requisite ability to serve as civilian Commissioners on full time salaries than to find nine part-time people who are capable of doing a good job on the Council. Councilmen will have a hard and thankless job with relatively little prestige and heavy responsibilities.

As an example of the manner in which the Council will operate, let us take the budget. Under the President's proposed Reorganization Plan the single Commissioner sends his

**MR. SAMUEL SPENCER, FORMER PRESIDENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS, OPPOSES THE PRESIDENT'S DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION PLAN**

(MR. NELSEN (at the request of Mr. McClure) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, by means of Reorganization Plan No. 3, the President proposes to replace the executive of the District of Columbia, the Board of Commissioners, with a single Commissioner and a nine-member part-time Council. The powers and duties of the present three-man Board would be divided between the single Commissioner and the Council. Each would be able to exercise veto power over each other. All would be appointed by the President.

The President justifies his plan on the ground that the District of Columbia government needs more "efficiency and responsiveness." I, and many of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle, are deeply concerned that just the opposite will result if the President's plan is allowed to pass unamended.

Mr. Samuel Spencer, former President of the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners, evidently shares our concern as his letter which follows will indicate. His observations stem from his personal experience at the head of the District of Columbia government and as a lifelong resident of the District of Columbia.

In addition to his expressed doubts about the workability of the President's proposal, Mr. Spencer makes several recommendations, among them: continuation of the Board of Commissioners, the employment of a city manager to assist the Board in its administrative functions, and the abolition by the Presi-